



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/567,573	02/08/2006	Pol Nisenblat	P-8430-US	2537
49443	7590	05/31/2007	EXAMINER	
PEARL COHEN ZEDEK LATZER, LLP 1500 BROADWAY 12TH FLOOR NEW YORK, NY 10036			WACHSMAN, HAL D	
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2857				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
05/31/2007		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/567,573	NISENBLAT ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Hal D. Wachsman	2857	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 March 2007.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-49 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) 35-46 is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) 32-34 is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-3, 20-31, 47-49 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) 4-19 is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on 08 February 2006 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) Other: _____

1. Applicant's election without traverse of Group I (claims 1-34 and 47-49) in the reply filed on 3-6-07 is acknowledged.
2. Claims 35-46 stand withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on 3-6-07.
3. The drawings are objected to because they are labeled at top as the drawings of WO 2005/101032 and PCT/IL2004/000332. Appropriate correction is required.
4. The amendment to the specification in the Preliminary Amendment filed 2-8-06 is improper under 37 C.F.R. 1.121 because it does not indicate that it is an insertion and does not indicate the precise location in the specification where the insertion paragraph is to be inserted. Appropriate correction is required.
5. The Abstract provided is improper because it is not on a separate sheet (37 C.F.R. 1.72). The Abstract that has been provided is a part of the first page of WO 2005/101032 A1). Appropriate correction is required.
6. The listing of references in the specification (see pages 1 and 9 of the specification) is not a proper information disclosure statement. 37 CFR 1.98(b) requires a list of all patents, publications, or other information submitted for consideration by the Office, and MPEP § 609.04(a) states, "the list may not be incorporated into the specification but must be submitted in a separate paper." Therefore, unless the references have been cited by the examiner on form PTO-892, they have not been considered.

7. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

8. Claims 1-34 and 49 are objected to under 37 C.F.R. 1.75(a) for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as the invention. Claim 1, line 4, cites "a plurality of components" which is vague with respect to what type of components of the power signal are being referred to here. Claim 1, line 6, cites "the values of least some of the components" which is vague with respect to what type of values are being referred to here. Claim 1, line 6, cites "a plurality of periods" however is this the same "periods" cited previously in claim 1 ? Claim 3, line 2, cites "a model" which is vague with respect to what type or types of models are being referred to here. Claim 13, line 2, cites "the signals" which lacks clear antecedent basis. Claim 14, line 3, cites "the signal" however is this referring to the power signal ? Claim 15, line 1, cites "sampling the signals" which lacks clear antecedent basis. Claim 16, line 2, cites "determining from the acquired samples" however determining what from the acquired samples ? This same type of problem also occurs in claim 17, line 2. Claim 19, line 2, cites "the compressed harmonic values" however was this intended to be "the compressed harmonic component values" ? Claim 30, lines 2-3, cite "the cycles of the waveform" which lacks clear antecedent basis. The preamble of claim 32 cites "A method of compressing values of a monitored electrical power signal" however there is not a clear reference to "compressing" in the body of the claim. Claim 49 cites "A device according to claim 47...." however claim 47 is a **method claim**. The examiner asks the applicant to better claim the limitations cited above. While

the examiner understands the intentions of the applicant he feels confusion could be drawn from the limitations cited above. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

9. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

10. Claims 1-3, 20, 21, 23-26, 31 and 47-49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by "An enhanced data compression method for applications in power quality analysis" (Ribeiro et al.).

As per claim 1, Ribeiro et al. (Abstract, figure 8) disclose "acquiring data representing periods of the waveform". Ribeiro et al. (section II, pages 676, 677) disclose "decomposing the waveform of the power signal...over a plurality of periods of the waveform". Ribeiro et al. (section III – page 677, section IV – pages 677, 678) disclose "compressing the values...over a plurality of periods separately".

As per claim 2, Ribeiro et al. (section II, pages 676, 677) disclose the feature of this claim.

As per claim 3, Ribeiro et al. (section IV – pages 677, 678) disclose the feature of this claim.

As per claim 20, Ribeiro et al. (see at least figure 4) disclose the feature of this claim.

As per claim 21, Ribeiro et al. (figure 4, page 678 – see Time Index which can specify the time interval) disclose the feature of this claim.

As per claim 23, Ribeiro et al. (section III – page 677, section IV – pages 677, 678) disclose the feature of this claim.

As per claim 24, Ribeiro et al. (section III – page 677, section IV – pages 677, 678) disclose the feature of this claim.

As per claim 25, Ribeiro et al. (section IV – pages 677, 678) disclose the feature of this claim.

As per claim 26, Ribeiro et al. (section III – page 677, section IV – pages 677, 678) disclose the feature of this claim.

As per claim 31, Ribeiro et al. (section II – pages 676, 677, figure 8) disclose the feature of this claim.

As per claim 47, Ribeiro et al. (Abstract, section II – pages 676, 677) disclose “acquiring samples of the power signal”. Ribeiro et al. (section IV – pages 677, 678) disclose “compressing the samples of the power signal using a lossy compression method”.

As per claim 48, Ribeiro et al. (section IV – pages 677, 678) disclose the feature of this claim.

As per claim 49, Ribeiro et al. (section VII – page 679) disclose the feature of this claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

11. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

12. Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over "An enhanced data compression method for applications in power quality analysis".(Ribeiro et al.) in view of Wiese, Jr. (6,493,666).

As per claim 22, Wiese, Jr. (see at least abstract) teaches the feature of this claim. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply the techniques of Wiese, Jr. to the invention of Ribeiro et al. as specified above because as taught by Wiese, Jr. (col. 1 lines 15-17) the ability

to transmit data rapidly to virtually any place in the world has become one of the defining characteristics of the current information age.

13. Claims 27 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over "An enhanced data compression method for applications in power quality analysis" (Ribeiro et al.) in view of "Exploring the power of wavelet analysis" (Galli et al.).

As per claim 27, Galli et al. (page 40 – Analysis of Power System Transients and figure 8) teach the feature of this claim. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply the techniques of Galli et al. to the invention of Ribeiro et al. as specified above because as taught by Galli et al. (page 40) transient analysis is quite different from steady-state analysis as voltages and currents are generally not periodic functions of time and oftentimes we are interested in transients of short duration (e.g., the inrush current of a distribution transformer).

As per claim 28, Galli et al. (page 40 – Analysis of Power System Transients and figure 8) teach the feature of this claim. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply the techniques of Galli et al. to the invention of Ribeiro et al. as specified above because as taught by Galli et al. (page 40) transient analysis is quite different from steady-state analysis as voltages and currents are generally not periodic functions of time and oftentimes we are interested in transients of short duration (e.g., the inrush current of a distribution transformer).

14. Claims 29 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over "An enhanced data compression method for applications in power quality analysis" (Ribeiro et al.) in view of Van Doorn et al. (5,736,847).

As per claim 29, Van Doorn et al. (see at least figures 5 and 6) teach the feature of this claim. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply the techniques of Van Doorn et al. to the invention of Ribeiro et al. as specified above because Ribeiro et al. disclose an invention for use in *power quality* analysis and Van Doorn et al. (col. 1 lines 12-15) relates to a digital power monitoring system which provides the capability to monitor the **quality of the power** being transmitted through a power system.

As per claim 30, Van Doorn et al. (col. 7 lines 38-63) teach the feature of this claim. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply the techniques of Van Doorn et al. to the invention of Ribeiro et al. as specified above because Ribeiro et al. disclose an invention for use in *power quality* analysis and Van Doorn et al. (col. 1 lines 12-15) relates to a digital power monitoring system which provides the capability to monitor the **quality of the power** being transmitted through a power system.

15. Claims 32-34 are allowed subject to the appropriate correction of the 37 C.F.R. 1.75(a) objections noted in paragraph 8 above.

Claims 4-19 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the

base claim and any intervening claims and subject to the appropriate correction of the 37 C.F.R. 1.75(a) objections noted in paragraph 8 above.

16. The following references are cited as being art of general interest: "An improved method for signal processing and compression in power quality evaluation" (Ribeiro et al.), Griffin, Jr. et al. (6,675,071) which disclose a power quality utility metering system having waveform capture, Splett et al. (6,599,242) which disclose data compression of heart signals, Muhlenberg et al. (5,836,982) which disclose compression using lossless techniques, Holaday et al. (6,473,700) which disclose compressing digital data for waveform viewing and Wegener (7,071,852) which disclose test and measurement instruments using compression and decompression.

17. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hal D. Wachsman whose telephone number is 571-272-2225. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday 7:00 A.M. to 4:30 P.M..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eliseo Ramos Feliciano can be reached on 571-272-7925. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.


Hal D. Wachsman
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2857

HW
May 25, 2007